



Sheep, Wheat, and Wine: An Achaemenian Antecedent of the Sasanian Sacrifices *pad ruwān*

A N T O N I O P A N A I N O

DIPARTIMENTO DI STORIE E METODI PER LE CONSERVAZIONE DEI BENI CULTURALI, RAVENNA

A little passage contained in the *Anabasis* of Arrian (VI, 29, 7), that originally belonged to a lost work by Aristobulos of Cassandreia¹ (as stated in VI, 29, 4),² briefly mentions the office performed by the Magi in honour and memory of Cyrus the Great. This important piece of information is found within a well-known chapter concerning the sacrilegious violence perpetrated against the tomb³ and the body of the first Persian king and the restoration subsequently ordered by Alexander (VI, 29, 9–11).

The present contribution will focus on the paragraph about the ritual, which in my opinion is also relevant for the interpretation of some passages in the great inscription of Šābuhr I (ŠKZ). A consideration of these parallels will confirm the importance of the cultural continuity in the politico-religious traditions of Western Iran from the Achaemenian past to the Sasanian period, a subject frequently investigated by our friend and colleague Prof. Prods Oktor Skjærvø,⁴ to whom this study is dedicated.

According to Arrian's text (VI, 29, 7):

Εἶναι δὲ ἐντὸς τοῦ περιβόλου πρὸς τῇ ἀναβάσει τῇ ἐπὶ τὸν τάφον φερούσῃ οἶκημα σμικρὸν τοῖς Μάγοις ποποιημένον, οἱ δὲ ἐφύλασσον τὸν Κύρου τάφον ἔτι ἀπὸ Καμβύσου τοῦ Κύρου, παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς ἐκδεχόμενος τὴν φυλακὴν. Καὶ τούτοις πρόβατόν τε ἐς ἡμέραν ἐδίδοτο ἐκ βασιλέως καὶ ἀλευρών τε καὶ οἶνου τεταγμένα καὶ ἵππος κατὰ μῆνα ἐς θυσίαν τῷ Κύρῳ.

"Within the enclosure and by the ascent to the tomb itself there was a small building⁵ put up for the Magians who used to guard Cyrus' tomb, from as long ago as Cambyzes, son of Cyrus, an office transmitted from father to son. The king

used to give them a sheep a day, a fixed amount of wheat and wine, and a horse each month to sacrifice to Cyrus."⁶

Strabo (XV, 3, 7), whose ultimate source was again Aristobulos, mentions the presence of a group of Magi attending at the tomb of Cyrus; in particular he wrote:

Συμβῆναι δὲ ταῦτα, καίπερ φυλακῆς περικειμένης Μάγων, σίτησιν λαμβανόντων καθ' ἡμέραν πρόβατον, διὰ μηνὸς δ' ἵππον.⁷

"But these things happened, notwithstanding the surrounding surveillance of the Magi, who received as food a sheep every day and a horse every month."

Although various scholars have already discussed these passages, sometimes in detail, as for instance Briant,⁸ the possible comparison between this Achaemenian office and the sacrifices to be offered *pad ruwān* in the framework of ŠKZ has not yet been considered in detail.

In fact, both Arrian's text and that of Strabo (although in the latter case the sheep or lamb and the horse are erroneously considered as a kind of payment for the work of the Magi) give a list of the "ingredients" necessary for a sacrifice which basically correspond to those mentioned in ŠKZ.

As we know from ŠKZ 33,⁹ a special fire (*ādur*, πυρεῖον) was established "for the soul and the future fame" (MP *pad amā ruwān ud pannām*; Parth. *pad amā arwān ud pāšnām*; Gr. ἡμῶν μνείαν καὶ ὀνόματος συντήρησιν) of the living king Šābuhr; furthermore, as stated in ŠKZ 33–34,¹⁰

other fire-temples were erected in order to perform offices on behalf of the king's relatives as well as some other nobles (see ŠKZ 35–38).¹¹ According to ŠKZ 35, Šābuhr offered to these fire-temples 1,000 lambs which were part of his own surplus¹² (*akbrīd* 1,000 in Middle Persian and Parthian; ἐκείνων τῶν χειλίων προβάτων in the Gr. text).¹³ Then, as is detailed in ŠKZ 36, he ordered one animal every day plus bread and wine to be offered as a sacrifice on his own behalf:

MP *pad amā ruwān rōz ō rōz akbrīd 1, nān g(rīw) 1 h(ōfan) 5, may p(ās) 4* [. . .] “for our soul every day one lamb, one *grīw*¹⁴ (and) five *hōfan*¹⁵ of bread, and four *pās* of wine [. . .]”;

Parth. *pad amā arwān rōž ō rōž akbrīd ēw, nān ēw grīw ud 5 hōfān, maδ 4 pās* “for our soul every day one lamb, one *grīw* (and) five *hōfan* of bread, and four *pās* of wine [. . .]”;

Gr. εἰς τὴν μνείαν ἡμῶν πρόβατον ἡμερίσιον ἓν καὶ ἄρτων μόδιος εἷς ἡμισυς, οἶνου πασάτας τέσσαρας [. . .] “for the memory of us one lamb and one and a half *modius* of bread, four *pās* of wine [. . .].”

Furthermore, Šābuhr ordered *only* “one lamb, one and a half *modius* of bread and four *pās* of wine” to be offered (presumably every day)¹⁶ for a group of relatives mentioned in ŠKZ 36–38; finally, he established the same sacrifice for the souls of other nobles (listed in ŠKZ 40–50), although in this case the sacrificial animals were merely those left over,¹⁷ i.e. 270,¹⁸ after the number required for the two preceding offices (365 lambs for the king himself, 365 for his relatives) had been deducted from the original 1,000.¹⁹ In any case, the presence of so many lambs (or sheep)²⁰—the sacrificial animal *par excellence*, as shown by the choice of the Greek term πρόβατον²¹—clearly implies their daily immolation on behalf of the souls,²² a ritual office expressed in §39 of ŠKZ by means of the verb YDBHWNtn (MP *yaštan*), YOB Dytn (Parth. *ya-zīdan*) and μαγεύειν (text: μαγεύσωσιν).²³

As we have seen, the performance of such a ritual with the immolation of a lamb every day (πρόβατον ἡμερίσιον) and an offering of bread (ἄρτων) and wine (οἶνου) was something special, reserved for the current ruler; it was possible to honour other persons with a similar ritual, although they as a group received only the same amount as was offered for the soul of Šābuhr alone. In the case of Cyrus, the founder of the Persian empire, the

sacrifice to be performed *daily* by the Magi included a lamb or sheep (πρόβατόν τε ἐς ἡμέραν) and fixed quantities (τεταγμένα) of wheat (ἀλεύρων) and wine (οἶνου). Leaving aside the horse²⁴ which, according to Arrian, was to be sacrificed additionally every month, the two sacrificial offices no doubt followed the same pattern.

Although Maricq²⁵ pointed out that the Greek interpreter of ŠKZ may have made a mistake in translating MP *rōz ō rōz akbrīd 1* and Parth. *rōž ō rōž akbrīd ēw* with πρόβατον ἡμερίσιον ἓν, since the Iranian *Vorlage* clearly insists on the fact that the whole performance should be enacted every day, we cannot rule out the possibility that the Greek scribe deliberately stressed the fact that a sacrificial animal was to be immolated *daily*.²⁶ Since the animal was intrinsically the most expensive part of the sacrifice,²⁷ its daily immolation indicated the extraordinary importance attributed to the ritual on behalf of the king's soul. Šābuhr himself insists on the high number of sacrificial animals consecrated to these rituals (1,000), mentioning (ŠKZ 35) the emission of a special document as guarantee of the honours attributed to the fire-temples,²⁸ but also noting (ŠKZ 39) that only the remainder of the animals sacrificed on behalf of his soul and those of his close relatives should be used for the other nobles. In this case, the parallelism with Arrian's πρόβατόν τε ἐς ἡμέραν would be extraordinarily striking, although it is clear in both cases that the ritual did not involve an immolation exclusively, but also other offerings such as wine and bread or wheat. In other words, the supposed mistake attributed to the Greek translator does not really change the meaning of the passage, because it is self-evident that the daily sacrifice of *one* πρόβατον (ἡμερίσιον) also involved the ritual offering of bread and wine. Also in the other passages where the expression “every day” was not used,²⁹ we may assume that the immolation, when it took place,³⁰ did not exclude the presence of the other offerings.

Coming back to Arrian's text, we must consider an interesting problem: some scholars, for instance Briant, seem to understand this passage as indicating that only a horse was offered by the king for the sacrifice, while the sheep, wheat and wine were given to the Magi as a kind of remuneration. Thus Briant writes:³¹ “Les prêtres chargés des sacrifices devant la tombe de Cyrus reçoivent des rations pour eux-mêmes (un mouton par jour, vin et farine) et un cheval par

mois pour le sacrifice." The same interpretation was perhaps implicit in Brunt's translation³² of καὶ τούτοις πρόβατόν τε ἐς ἡμέραν ἐδίδοτο ἐκ βασιλέως καὶ ἀλεύρων τε καὶ οἴνου τεταγμένα καὶ ἵππος κατὰ μῆνα ἐς θυσίαν τῷ Κύρῳ as "the king used to give them a sheep a day, a fixed amount of meal³³ and wine, and a horse each month to sacrifice to Cyrus."

I think that this restricted interpretation, which introduces a sharp distinction which cannot be deduced from the text and which seriously diminishes its importance, is unnecessary.³⁴ From the syntactical point of view we may note that the items in the list πρόβατόν τε (ἐς ἡμέραν), ἀλεύρων τε καὶ οἴνου τεταγμένα καὶ ἵππος (κατὰ μῆνα) are all governed by the same verb, ἐδίδοτο; the only serious opposition is that between πρόβατον, which is ἐς ἡμέραν, and ἵππος, which, in its turn, is κατὰ μῆνα. The sheep must be killed every day, the horse, which is more expensive and valuable, only every month. Both animals together with wheat and wine have been given (ἐδίδοτο) by the king (ἐκ βασιλέως) in order to be offered in sacrifice (ἐς θυσίαν) on behalf of the soul of Cyrus (τῷ Κύρῳ). The idea that only the horse was offered as a sacrificial animal, while all the rest was given as a food ration, is in my opinion philologically groundless and based on aprioristic arguments. In addition, this interpretation is contradicted by various pieces of evidence:

1) The fact that Strabo erroneously considered both the daily sheep and the monthly horse (καθ' ἡμέραν πρόβατον, διὰ μηνὸς δ' ἵππον) as the Magi's ration of food (σίτησιν) paradoxically shows that these two animals belong to the same category, and that the most important contrast in the text is the frequency with which the one and the other are killed/immolated.

2) The Iranian sacrificial tradition does not require the complete destruction through incineration³⁵ of any part of the killed animal, with the exception of some offerings of fat (*zōhr*)³⁶ and, perhaps, of the *omentum*;³⁷ it is the animal breath or soul³⁸ which belongs to the divine dimension,³⁹ while its flesh might be eaten after the ritual,⁴⁰ as already noted by Herodotus I, 132,⁴¹ and Strabo XV, 3, 13–15.⁴² Thus we may presume that the animals and other offerings were not destroyed, but that after the completion of the office the priests attending at the sacrifice consumed the meat.

3) As Briant already noted,⁴³ the Elamite tablets of Persepolis, in particular those discovered

in the Fortification, preserve at least two series of documents, which precisely agree with Arrian's source, although they belong to a period later than that of Cambyses (who apparently founded the ritual in memory of his father). The series denominated "E"⁴⁴ by Hallock (PF 336–431, 2029–30)⁴⁵ mentions ritual goods such as flour and grain, wine, beer, fruit, and sheep "utilized"⁴⁶ in the framework of different religious and sacrificial ceremonies, in honour of not only Iranian but also Elamite and Babylonian gods. The following tablets definitely concern Iranian gods: PF 336 (grain), ceremony in honour of Mišduši,⁴⁷ perhaps an epithet of Aši; PF 337 (grain), ceremony in honour of Ahuramazdā and Mišduši; PF 338 (wine) for Ahuramazdā, Miθra, and Šimut; PF 339 (wine) for Ahuramazdā (etc.). In the context of the Zoroastrian tradition the employment of wine in the *yasna* has been a debated subject,⁴⁸ but it is clear from these tablets that Achaemenian Mazdean priests (as well as Parthian⁴⁹ and Sasanian ones)⁵⁰ did use wine for ritual purposes. The other series mentioned by Briant⁵¹ is Hallock's "K1"⁵² (PF 741–74, 2036),⁵³ which consists of texts dealing with "Rations for individuals with religious functions." In this series we find sentences arranged according to a basic pattern (although variants are attested): a certain quantity of food (grain, beer, flour, wine, etc.), supplied by somebody, is received by an individual (generally an official) as a regular monthly "ration" (*gal*)⁵⁴ of the *lan* ceremony,⁵⁵ i.e. a kind of ritual which cannot be exactly determined; then a date follows. As Briant has emphasized, the priests⁵⁶ never received meat according to these Elamite tablets. I do not understand why Briant supposes that the Magi at the tomb of Cyrus were given an extraordinary quantity of food (although he admits that their number is not at all clear).⁵⁷ In fact, the whole Greek passage, as we can infer from the supportive witness of the Elamite tablets,⁵⁸ probably makes no direct reference to rations of food, but simply concerns what is to be sacrificed in honour of Cyrus' soul. The already quoted tablet PF 337, in which 800 quarts of grain (400 for Ahuramazdā and 400 for Mišduši) are utilized, as Hallock makes clear,⁵⁹ for a divine ceremony (*bakadaušiya*),⁶⁰ attests to the fact that, when the ritual was over, "the workers consumed (it)." Thus we may presume that a definitive distinction between a sacred and a practical function is ruled out, because the "sacrificial food" can be consumed after the ritual.

The ritual triad “animal (= meat), bread, and wine” no doubt enjoyed a remarkable importance; in fact, if the comparison between the Achaemenian and Sasanian customs is sound, its presence also in the framework of the Kirdir’s vision assumes a new relevance. Following an insightful conjecture advanced by Kellens⁶¹ (and also thanks to a new photograph published by W. Hinz),⁶² most scholars now assume that the last words of KSM 49 (§ 34) refer to the same ritual triad: “bread, meat, and wine” (*nān ud gōšt ud may* [LHM’ W BSR’ W HS]).⁶³ Although the late D. N. MacKenzie prudently wrote⁶⁴ that “it is impossible to say whether Kerdīr’s double partook of ‘bread and meat and wine’ or, in some miraculous way, was able to make an offering of them,” Skjærvø’s suggestion⁶⁵ that the inscription may refer to a paradisiacal food deserves to be carefully considered. The alternative solution proposed by Gignoux,⁶⁶ who assumes an allusion to a sacrificial ritual, seems to me less probable in the context. While gods and human beings in paradise could reasonably be supposed to be delighted by sacrifices offered on earth, it seems improbable that an actual immolation—if indeed an animal sacrifice is assumed to be implied—would be supposed to take place in the celestial dimension. In any case, the presence of meat, rather than a live lamb or sheep, is not a matter of chance; it probably “represents” the sacrificial animal itself, although it is not properly the same thing, but can be considered as the symbolic fruit of a sacrifice offered on earth.

Thus, thanks to this passage partly preserved in the context of Kirdīr’s vision, we may gain an idea of how the Mazdean clergy symbolically interpreted the result of the sacrificial offerings, in particular those offered *pad ruwān*. The mention of the triad “bread, meat, and wine” in the presence of the golden throne and the god Wahrām appears to be a kind of celestial “reification” of the sacrifice, the new food of the paradise.⁶⁷ What men offer to the gods and *pad ruwān*, both in life and (by means of their descendants) in the afterlife, will be found again in paradise and distributed in bliss.⁶⁸ This simple but seminal idea, which probably inspired also those who ordered the ritual in memory of Cyrus the Great, seems to be confirmed by some additional Greek sources mentioning the practice of honouring the king’s δαίμων at banquets.⁶⁹ Theopompus, in his *Philippica* quoted by Athenaeus (VI, 60), noted that the

Persians, every day [καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν], prepared a separate table for the δαίμων of the king.⁷⁰ Already L. R. Taylor⁷¹ connected this homage offered to the δαίμων of the living king with the daily offerings to Cyrus mentioned by Arrian, although she suggested some general conclusions about the Achaemenian kingship to which Tarn raised a number of objections.⁷² The mention of banquets in honour of the royal δαίμων is in any case very interesting as another indication of a direct connection between food and spirit; a daily terrestrial banquet celebrates the incorporeal being of the king. I cannot say that this custom was (*ante litteram*) a kind of dinner or supper *pad ruwān*, but it is clear that good food and a well-appointed table opened the gates of “paradise,” not only to the king but also to his relatives and of course to his obedient servants.

Notes

1. See Auberger 2001, 366–67. Cf. already Steele 1919, 148; Brunt 1974. We may recall that Aristobulos was entrusted with the restoration of Cyrus’ tomb at Pasargadae, so he should be very well informed on this subject (see Pearson 1952, 71 and n. 2; cf. also Badian 1958, 150, n. 6).
2. See Auberger 2001, 420–23; Brunt 1983, 192–93.
3. See Zournatzi 1990.
4. See, for instance, Skjærvø 1985, 1988.
5. Briant (1996, 923) recalls that Pliny (VI, 29, 116) may contain an indirect reference to this little construction belonging to the Magi.
6. I have followed the translation offered by Brunt (1983, 193, 195) with the exception of Gr. ἄλευρα, here translated “wheat” instead of “meal” for reasons I will explain later on.
7. See Auberger 2001, 424–25.
8. 1996, 107–8, 923.
9. See Huyse 1999, vol. 1, 46; vol. 2, 104–9; cf. Maricq 1958, 316 = 1965, 58.
10. See Huyse 1999, vol. 1, 46–47; vol. 2, 107–10; cf. Maricq 1958, 316 = 1965, 58.
11. See Huyse 1999, vol. 1, 48–52; vol. 2, 111–24. Cf. Sprengling 1940a, 340.
12. MP and Parth. **tarkafīšn*, Gr. ταρκάπησιν; cf. Huyse 1999, vol. 2, 113. We may note that a sacrifice of 1,000 sheep is required as an expiatory ritual according to Widēwdād XVIII, 70, but the case is different (cf. also Henning 1954, 42 = 1977, vol. 2, 417); see Boyce 1966, 104.
13. Huyse 1999, vol. 1, 48; vol. 2, 111–12.
14. Cf. Huyse 1999, vol. 2, 114.

15. Cf. Huyse 1999, vol. 2, 114–15.
16. See the discussion of the problem in the following notes.
17. Huyse 1999, vol. 1, 52.
18. See Sprengling 1940b, 396; Henning 1954, 42–45 (= 1977, vol. 2, 417–19).
19. See already Maricq 1958, 320, n. 4 = 1965, 62, n. 4; Huyse 1999, vol. 2, 124. At the end of the list of the king's close relatives in ŠKZ 38 the words prescribing the daily sacrifice are omitted, but we may presume that, as a daily ritual was dedicated to the soul of the living king, another one, probably daily as well, was devoted to those of his close relatives. The ritual on behalf of the other nobles mentioned in the following catalogue cannot have been performed every day, notwithstanding what is written in the MP version of §40 (see n. 23 below), because the number of animals available was insufficient, as stated in §39.
20. Henning 1954, 42–43 (= 1977, vol. 2, 417–18). See also Sprengling 1940b, 388. The importance of *pasu-*, m., small cattle (probably sheep) as a sacrificial animal in the Avestan ritual too is well attested (see, e.g. Yt. 8, 58; Panaino 1990, 58, 145).
21. Although some later juridical sources such as the *Mādayān ī Hazār Dādestān* mention the use of liturgical offices such as the *Yasna* and the *Widēwdād* in connection with special anniversaries (for instance, a birthday or the anniversary of a death; see de Menasce 1964, 46–47, 60), it is impossible to deny the practice of ritual immolations in Sasanian times; see also Boyce and Kotwal 1971a, 63, and for later periods Boyce 1991, 290.
22. See, e.g., de Menasce 1964; Macuch 1981, *passim*; *idem*, 1993, 5, 12, *passim*. Cf. Huyse 1999, vol. 2, 105–7 (with additional bibliography).
23. Huyse 1999, vol. 2, 124. Cf. Sprengling 1940b, 394; Benveniste 1964, 51–53; Maricq 1958, 320, n. 5 = 1965, 62, n. 5; Boyce 1966, 102–6; de Jong 1997, 146–47, 357–62; Panaino 2006, 178–82.
24. About this sacrifice see Briant 1996, 923, with the basic bibliography on this subject.
25. 1958, 318–19, n. 6 = 1965, 60–61, n. 6. Cf. Huyse 1999, vol. 2, 114.
26. Note that Rubin (2002, 294, n. 4, referring also to Pugliese Carratelli 1947, 238–39) thinks that the use of ἡμερίσιον is elliptical, the mistake being only the use of a nominative (instead of an accusative) in μόδιος εἶς ἡμῖνος.
27. The high cost of animal sacrifices is well recognized in the Pahlavi sources including the later ones; see Boyce 1966, 102–3; 1968, 278, n. 51.
28. See Maricq 1958, 318 = 1965, 60; Huyse 1999, vol. 1, 48; vol. 2, 111.
29. See ŠKZ 38 (in the three versions). The fact that ŠKZ 40 includes a mention of the ritual to be performed every day (*rōz ō rōz*), though only in the MP version (Huyse 1999, vol. 1, 53; vol. 2, 124), is peculiar, since the number of sacrificial animals would have been insufficient for another systematic daily immolation in the case of this third list ($365 \times 3 = 1,095$). It may be recalled that Maricq (1958, 320–30 = 1965, 62–72) divided this list comprising the “other” members of the court into four sub-lists.
30. Henning (1954, 43, n. 8 = 1977, vol. 2, 418, n. 8) assumed that an elliptical reference to the daily sacrifice was implied in the paragraph referring to the second list (that consisting of the members of Šābuhr's family).
31. 1966, 107.
32. 1983, 195.
33. *My italics*.
34. Already Taylor (1927, 54) no doubt considered the wine, meal, and sheep as a daily offering to the king.
35. Heesterman 1993, *passim*; de Jong 1997, 132, 360–61.
36. See the detailed study offered by the late M. Boyce (1966).
37. See Boyce 1966, 108; de Jong 1997, 130–42, in particular 135; 360–61.
38. See de Jong 1997, 131–33.
39. See also Kellens 1991, 50–51; Panaino 2004, 74.
40. See Boyce 1966, 103–4.
41. See de Jong 1997, 116–19.
42. See de Jong 1997, 120–56, in particular 130–33.
43. Briant 1996, 107.
44. Hallock 1969, 18–20.
45. Hallock 1969, 150–68, 627.
46. Hence Hallock's denomination of this Series as “Utilization”; see Hallock 1969, 18.
47. See the note by I. Gershevitch apud Hallock 1969, 732; Gershevitch (1969, 174) reconstructs **miž-duši-*, the expected OIr. feminine form of an adjective corresponding to Vedic *mīdhvās-* (m.), *mīdhuṣī-* (f.), “bountiful, liberal”; Koch 1991, 94–95; 1977, 90–92. Cf. de Jong 1997, 61, 104–5.
48. See the detailed treatment of the problem by de Jong 1997, 140–42, 353–57. We may in any case recall that wine was still used in later times in the *Āfrīnagān* ritual; see Modi 1937, 370–72. The Avestan word for “wine,” *maḍu-*, n. (Bartholomae 1904, 1114) is quite rare and does not occur in relevant contexts, so that it is impossible to evaluate its possible ritual use; see also Gignoux 1999b. The presence of solid offerings is well known from the Avestan sources; cf. *miiazda-*, n. “offering of solid food,” corresponding to Skt. *mi-yēdha-*, m. “sacrificial oblation, offering of food” (Bartholomae 1904, 1191; Kellens and Pirart 1990, 288), which in later times was associated with the “sacred bread” (*drōn*), fruit, wine, milk, etc. See Modi 1937, 368–72; Boyce and Kotwal 1971a; 1971b, *passim*; Kotwal and Boyd 1991, 134 and *passim*. On the potential

correspondence between some Zoroastrian funeral rites and those mentioned in the Derveni Papyrus, see Russell (2001, 49–59) and Panaino 2009, 34–40. With regard to the Elamite sources see also Hallock 1950, 239–40.

49. The existence of vineyards “from which wine was supplied to Mihrdātkert” in order to perform *pat ruvān* services is well attested in Parthian secular sources; see Lukonin 1983, 694.

50. See Henning 1954, 43, n. 3 (= 1977, vol. 2, 418, n. 3) with additional bibliography.

51. 1996, 107.

52. Hallock 1969, 25–26.

53. Hallock 1969, 223–30, 629.

54. Hallock 1969, 685; Hinz and Koch 1987, vol. 1, 420.

55. Hallock 1969, 720; Hinz and Koch 1987, vol. 2, 802. See Koch 1977, 129–41; 1987, 241–45; 1991, 89–91. See also Basello 2004, 193–209.

56. For the priests mentioned in the Elamite tablets see Koch 1987, 245–47.

57. 1996, 107–8. On the other hand, Briant (1996, 923) mentions the fact that Pharnaces (El. Parnaka, OP Farnaka), the greatest administrator of Persepolis at the time of Darius I, received two sheep every day, together with 90 quarts of wine and 180 quarts of flour (see Hallock 1985, 589). But this enormous ration is not that of a priest, and it is not mentioned in a ritual context.

58. Already Koch (1977, 147) noted the potential for comparing these Elamite sources with the paragraphs concerning the sacrificial offerings mentioned in the inscription of Šābuhr I (ŠKZ), although she indicated some doubt about the Iranian background of the rituals mentioned in the tablets.

59. 1985, 605.

60. Hinz and Koch 1987, vol. 1, 142.

61. 1975, 468 and n. 28; cf. Gignoux 1991, 98, n. 223; 1981, 257, n. 64. Lecoq (1972, 131) proposed the alternative reading HLB “milk.”

62. See MacKenzie 1989, 69.

63. See MacKenzie 1989, 51, 56, 60; cf. Gignoux 1991, 92, 98, n. 223.

64. MacKenzie 1989, 70.

65. Skjærvø 1983 288, 303–4.

66. See 1999b, 42.

67. In later times, as is confirmed by a Persian Rivāyat, the memory of the power of animal sacrifice was preserved in the *Ātaš-zōhr* performed on the dawn at the fourth day, when, before passing the Činvat bridge, the soul goes to the court of King Bahrām, i.e. as Boyce (1966, 101–2) explains, the *Ātaš-Bahrām*: “If the fat of a *gōspand* is offered as *zōr* to the *Ātaš-Bahrām*, the soul passes away thence happily, and *Ādar-Xwarrah* and the other *Amašaspands* help it, and it goes to the different stations of heaven.” The idea

that the fat of a sheep, if offered to the ritual fire, can open a kind of sacrificial path is in any case very pertinent for the passages discussed here. It is worth noting that also the *Āb-zōhr* can take the form of a special ritual of purification after death (see Boyce 1966, 111).

68. As Boyce underlined (1968, 270), many modern Zoroastrian rituals “are accompanied by offerings of food and drink, which are afterwards partaken of by the living in communion with the dead, the soul being invited back to join its kinsmen and friends, not in grief but in companionable happiness.”

69. Taylor 1927, 54–55.

70. Taylor 1927, 55. The frequency of references to a daily ceremony needs to be carefully considered.

71. See Taylor 1927, 54.

72. It is not the focus of this article to discuss again Taylor’s assumption that the δαίμων should correspond to the Av. *frauuāši-*, which was strongly criticized by Tarn (1928, 207–10). In my opinion, Taylor’s basic idea that it was possible in Achaemenian times to offer a sacrifice in favour of the spirit of a living king, a fact denied by Tarn, is sound; for instance, the worship of the *uruuan-* and the *frauuāši-* belonging to either the living or the dead (and sometimes also to those yet unborn) is well known in Avestan sources (see Panaino 2004, 66–75). On the other hand, Taylor’s conclusion that the offerings to the δαίμων corresponded to a divine cult of the Persian king does not take into consideration the evidence that everyone can offer a sacrifice in favour of his own soul or of that of any person living or dead.

References

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Auberger 2003 | J. Auberger. <i>Historiens d’Alexandre</i> . Textes traduits et annotés. Paris. |
| Badian 1958 | E. Badian. “The Eunuch Bagoas.” <i>The Classical Quarterly</i> 5.3–4:144–57. |
| Bartholomae 1904 | Chr. Bartholomae. <i>Altiranisches Wörterbuch</i> . Wiesbaden. |
| Basello 2004 | G. P. Basello. <i>Cultura Elamita e Civiltà Achemenide: Continuità e Trasformazioni</i> . Tesi per il Conseguimento del Dottorato di Ricerca. Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale.” Naples. |
| Benveniste 1964 | E. Benveniste. “Sur la terminologie iranienne du sacrifice.” <i>JA</i> 252:45–58. |
| Boyce 1966 | M. Boyce. “ <i>Ātaš-zōhr</i> and <i>Āb-zōhr</i> .” <i>JRAS</i> , 100–118. |

- Boyce 1968 _____ . "The Pious Foundations of the Zoroastrians." *BSOAS* 31.2:270–89.
- Boyce 1991 _____ . "Pādyāb and Nērang: Two Pahlavi Terms Further Reconsidered." *BSOAS* 54.2:281–91.
- Boyce and Kotwal 1971a M. Boyce and F. Kotwal. "Zoroastrian *bāj* and *drōn*—I." *BSOAS* 34:56–73.
- Boyce and Kotwal 1971b _____ . "Zoroastrian *bāj* and *drōn*—II." *BSOAS* 34.2:298–313.
- Briant 1996 P. Briant. *Histoire de l'Empire Perse de Cyrus à Alexandre*. Paris.
- Brunt 1974 P. A. Brunt. "Notes on Aristobulus of Cassandria." *The Classical Quarterly* 24.1:65–69.
- Brunt 1983 _____ . Arrian, *Anabasis of Alexander*. Books V–VII, *Indica*, with an English translation. Cambridge, Mass.
- de Jong 1997 A. de Jong. *Traditions of the Magi: Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin Literature*. Leiden.
- de Menasce 1964 J. de Menasce. *Feux et fondations pieuses dans le droit sassanide*. Paris.
- Gershevitch 1969 I. Gershevitch. "Iranian Nouns and Names in Elamite Garb." *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 165–200.
- Gignoux 1981 Ph. Gignoux. "Les voyages chamaniques dans le monde iranien." In *Monumentum Georg Morgenstierne*, vol. 1, 244–65. ActIr 21. Leiden.
- Gignoux 1999a _____ . *Les Quatre Inscriptions du Mage Kirdīr*. Textes et Concordances. Paris.
- Gignoux 1999b _____ . "Matériaux pour une histoire du vin dans l'Iran ancien." In *Matériaux pour l'histoire économique du monde iranien*, textes réunis par R. Gyselen et M. Szuppe, 33–50. Paris.
- Hallock 1950 R. T. Hallock. "New Light from Persepolis." *JNES* 9.4:237–53.
- Hallock 1969 _____ . *Persepolis Fortification Tablets*. OIP 92. Chicago.
- Hallock 1985 _____ . "The Evidence of the Persepolis Tablets." In *CHIr*, vol. 2, *The Median and Achaemenian Periods*, ed. I. Gershevitch, 588–609. Cambridge.
- Heesterman 1993 J. C. Heesterman. *The Broken World of Sacrifice: An Essay in Ancient Indian Ritual*. Chicago.
- Henning 1954 W. B. Henning. "Notes on the Great Inscription of Šāpūr I." In *Prof. Jackson Memorial Volume*, 40–54. Bombay.
- Henning 1977 _____ . *Selected Papers*. Vols. 1–2. ActIr 14–15. Tehran.
- Hinz and Koch 1987 W. Hinz and H. Koch. *Elamisches Wörterbuch*. Vols. 1–2. AMI Ergänzungsband 17. Berlin.
- Huyse 1999 P. Huyse. *Die dreisprachige Inschrift Šābuhrs I. an der Ka'ba-i Zardušt (ŠKZ)*. Vols. 1–2. CIIr. London.
- Kellens 1975 J. Kellens. "Mythes et conceptions avestiques sous les Sassanides." In *Monumentum H. S. Nyberg*, vol. 1, 457–70. ActIr 4. Tehran.
- Kellens 1991 _____ . *Zoroastre et l'Avesta ancien: Quatre leçons au Collège de France*. Paris.
- Kellens and Pirart 1990 J. Kellens and E. Pirart. *Les textes vieil avestiques*. Vol. 2, *Répertoires grammaticaux et lexique*. Wiesbaden.
- Koch 1977 H. Koch. *Die religiöse Verhältnisse der Darioszeit*. Wiesbaden.
- Koch 1987 _____ . "Götter und ihre Verehrung im achämenidischen Persien." *ZA* 77.2: 239–78.
- Koch 1991 _____ . "Zu Religion und Kulte im achämenidischen Kernland." In *La religion iranienne à l'époque achéménide: Actes du Colloque de Liège 11 décembre 1987*, ed. J. Kellens, 87–109. *Iranica Antiqua*, Supplement 5. Ghent.
- Kotwal and Boyd 1991 F. M. Kotal and J. W. Boyd. *A Persian Offering. The Yasna: A Zoroastrian High Liturgy*. Paris.
- Lecoq 1972 P. Lecoq. "Remarques sur l'inscription de Sar Mašhad." *StIr* 1:127–31.

- Lukonin 1983 V. G. Lukonin. "Political, Social and Administrative Institutions: Taxes and Trades." In *CHIr*, vol. 3.2, *The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Period*, ed. E. Yarshater. Cambridge.
- Macuch 1981 M. Macuch. *Das sasanidische Rechtsbuch "Mātakdān i hazār Dātistān."* Pt. 2. Wiesbaden.
- Maricq 1958 A. Maricq. "Res Gestae Divi Saporis." *Syria* 35:303–5.
- Maricq 1965 _____. *Classica et Orientalia*. Extrait de *Syria* 1955–1962 revu et corrigé augmenté d'un article inédit et d'un index. Paris.
- Modi 1937 J. J. Modi. *The Religious Ceremonies and Customs of the Parsees*. 2nd ed. Bombay.
- Panaino 1990 A. Panaino. *Tištrya*. Pt. 1, *The Avestan Hymn to Sirius*. Rome.
- Panaino 2004 _____. *Rite, parole et pensée dans l'Avesta ancien et récent: Quatre leçons au Collège de France (Paris, 7, 14, 21, 18 mai 2002)*, ed. V. Sadovski avec la collaboration rédactionnelle de S. Circassia. Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Veröffentlichungen zur Iranistik, no. 31. Vienna.
- Panaino 2006 _____. "References to the Term *Yašt* and Other Mazdean Elements in the Syriac and Greek *Martyrologia*." In *Proceedings of the Fifth Conference of Iranian Studies, Ravenna 2003*, ed. A. Panaino and A. Piras, vol. 1, 87–102. Milan.
- Panaino 2009 _____. "Aspetti della complessità degli influssi interculturali tra Grecia ed Iran." In *Grecia Maggiore: Intrecci culturali con l'Asia nel periodo arcaico. Graecia Maior. Atti del Simposio in occasione del 75. anniversario di Walter Burkert*, ed. C. Riedweg. 19–53. Basel.
- Pearson 1952 L. Pearson. "Aristobulus the Phocian." *The American Journal of Philology* 73.1:7–75.
- Pugliese Carratelli 1947 G. Pugliese Carratelli. "Res Gestae Divi Saporis." *La Parola del Passato* 5:209–39.
- Rubin 2002 Z. Rubin. "Res Gestae Divi Saporis: Greek and Middle Iranian in a Document of Sasanian Anti-Roman Propaganda." In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, ed. J. N. Adams, M. Janse, and S. Swain, 267–97. Oxford.
- Russell 2001 J. R. Russell. "The Magi in the Derveni Papyrus." *Nāme-ye Irān-e Bāstān* 1.1:49–59.
- Skjærvø 1983 P. O. Skjærvø. "'Kirdir's Vision': Translation and Analysis." *AMI* 16:269–306.
- Skjærvø 1985 _____. "Thematic and Linguistic Parallels in the Achaemenid and Sasanian Inscriptions." In *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*, vol. 2, 593–603. Leiden.
- Skjærvø 1988 _____. "Royalty and Early Iranian Literature." In *Proceedings of the Third Conference of Iranian Studies Held in Cambridge, 11th to 15th September 1995*, pt. 1, *Old and Middle Iranian Studies*, ed. N. Sims-Williams, 99–107. Wiesbaden.
- Sprengling 1940a M. Sprengling. "From Kartir to Shahpuhr I." *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 57.3:330–40.
- Sprengling 1940b _____. "Shahpuhr I, the Great on the Kaabah of Zoroaster (KZ)." *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 57.4:341–429.
- Steele 1919 R. B. Steele. "The Method of Arrian in the Anabasis." *Classical Philology* 14.2:147–57.
- Tarn 1928 W. W. Tarn. "The Hellenistic Ruler-Cult and the Daemon." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 48.2:206–19.
- Taylor 1927 R. L. Taylor. "The 'Proskynesis' and the Hellenistic Cult Rules." *The Journal of Hellenistic Studies* 47.1:53–62.
- Zournatzi 1990 A. Zournatzi. "Cyrus. V. The Tomb of Cyrus." In *Elr*, ed. E. Yarshater, vol. 4, 522–24. London.